

Remarks

The applicants have noted the Examiner's new objections under 35 USC 103(a) and have further amended independent claims 1, 4 and 9 to take such objections into account.

In particular, claim 1 clearly includes the limitation that the containers include respective individual slides, and that the containers are aligned with respective different video sequences.

The invention permits a complete slide-show presentation to be condensed into a relatively small file that can be output to a web browser so as to make a complex slide-show/video presentation displayable on a portable device, such as a Blackberry™, without the need for all the multi-media software necessary to produce such as show. The Blackberry™ can conveniently be sent to an overhead projector or the like. The presenter does not need to carry around a computer and associated software.

The Examiner's primary reference to Boezeman discloses a method of synchronizing different sequences, such as animation sequences and video sequences, but what Boezeman fails to disclose is a method wherein containers containing individual slides of the slide-show are draggable into an appropriate relationship with the frames of the video sequence so that it can be ensured that the slides are presented at the appropriate time relative to the video sequence. In Boezeman the overall positioning of the animation sequence can be adjusted relative to the video sequence, but there is no mechanism to permit the presentation of slides at precise times relative to the video frames due to the lack of the claimed "containers".

It is not entirely clear from the Office Action what part in Boezeman the Examiner considers corresponds to the "containers" in claim 1. What happens in Boezeman is that

first the user drops the animation part into the thumbnail area 112 (col. 7, line 15). At this point no draggable container exists. Next the user drags the play tool into the show block 103 (col. 7, line 21), and at this point the animation sequence appears in the show block 130 as play area 131 (col. 7, lines 21-22). If the whole animation sequence is regarded as the “container”, unlike the invention claimed, such a container does not contain an individual slide that can be aligned with a specific group of frames of the video sequence. Moreover, there is no mechanism for aligning “containers” with specific groups of video frames. Boezeman is a time-based system wherein the start of each sequence is referenced to the time line 84.

In Figure 12, Boezeman does disclose the display of an image I, which might be likened to a slide, but when the image is dropped into the thumbnail area (Figure 11), it initially appears during the entire show block. Boezeman provides a mechanism to hide the image using hide markers 180, 182 so as to ensure that the image only appears during a specific time sequence with reference to the time-line 84. Unlike the invention, the images are not placed in respective containers that can be moved alongside the stream of video frames.

Consequently, Boezeman fails to show a plurality of containers displayed along a time line, each container containing a respective slide that is aligned with a group of frames representing a video sequence. Indeed, Boezeman does not align the video sequence with the animation sequence, but plays them sequentially, as shown in Figure 12.

With regard to claim 4, it appears that the Examiner has equated the items 88, 90, 92 as “atoms” within the meaning of the present application. It is respectfully submitted that this is an incorrect reading of Boezeman. Item 88, for example, is the play tool (col. 7, line 20). This tool is dragged onto the show block in order to make the sequence in the

thumbnail (the animation sequence in Figure 4) appear in the show block. This tool is not draggable within a "container" to permit events within the container to be aligned with specific video frames or even times. The play tool 88 merely results in the sequence in the thumbnail area appearing in the show block. The invention, as defined in claim 4, defines a nested arrangement as claimed, which offers a second level of control, wherein the containers are first aligned to specific video frames in order to control the timing of the display of different slides, and then atoms within the containers are aligned with frames within the group of frames associated with a container such that events occurring during presentation of a slide (for example, the appearance of bulleted items) can be controlled. Boezeman clearly fails to teach this element.

Moran fails to remedy these deficiencies in that he does not disclose or suggest how his system could relate to a container-based system as claimed and described above. The Examiner has cited Moran to show the simultaneous display of video and animation. However, for the reasons cited, even if the video were displayed simultaneously in Boezman, such a system would lack the means to permit slides to be associated with specific frames, as claimed, and moreover as claimed in claim 4, to permit events within slides to be associated with selected frames occurring during presentation of those slides. Similar remarks apply to claim 9, which in the applicant's respectful submission is allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Allowance and reconsideration are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Registration No. 34519
Richard J. Mitchell
Agent of Record

MARKS & CLERK
P. O. Box 957, Station B,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
K1P 5S7
(613) 236-9561